

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending applications. The Final Office Action dated April 3, 2007 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

By this response, claims 1, 8, 11, 19, and 20 are amended. In particular, a feature in claim 3 is included in independent claim 1; features in claim 9 are included to included in independent claim 8; and features in claims 12, 16, 17 and 18 are included in independent claim 11. Claims 3, 9, 12, 16, 17 and 18 are cancelled. No new matter has been added. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

The rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2006/0152658 to Ozawa et al. (hereinafter "Ozawa '658") in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,092,062 to Ozawa et al. (hereinafter "Ozawa '062") and further in view of Japanese Patent Pub. No. 2000-111910 to Yanagi (hereinafter "Yanagi") is respectively traversed and reconsideration is requested. Applicants traversed the rejection because none of the cited prior art, including Yanagi, suggests the desirability of the claimed invention.

In particular, the Final Office Action states in the paragraph of page 5 that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the sequential backlight as taught by Yanagi with the trans-reflective display taught by the combination of Ozawa et al. and Ozawa in order to provide a display in which superior hue can be established. Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has misunderstood the teachings of Yanagi. Yangi discloses in paragraphs 0003-0005 and Figure 7 that a prior art device including a backlight having three mono-color CRTs,

such as R, G and B and an optical diffusion plate 53 formed on the front face has a problem in that the hue is inferior. Yanagi discloses in paragraphs 0007-0012 and Figure 1 providing a light filter sheet on the front face of the optical diffusion plate in order to obtain a superior hue. Accordingly, in contrast to the statement in the Office Action, Yanagi merely teaches the desirability of adding a light filter sheet. Therefore, none of the cited prior art, including Yanagi, suggests the desirability of the claimed invention as claimed by the Examiner..

On the other hand, independent claims 1 recites a trans-reflective liquid crystal display device including various features including, for example, “a backlight controller connected to the sequential backlight to control the timing of light emissions in the transmission mode.” Also, independent claim 8 recites a method of driving a trans-reflective liquid crystal display device having a plurality of pixels including various features including, for example, “dividing one frame into three sub- frames to transmit sequentially light having red, green, and blue colors in the transmission mode; and applying the same data voltage to the adjacent three pixels every sub frame in the transmission mode.” Furthermore, independent claim 11 recites a liquid crystal display device including various features, for example, “a timing controller that receives, converts, and outputs image data; a switching unit that determines the output signal of the timing controller according to a transmission mode or a reflection mode; and a backlight controller that controls the backlight based upon the output of the timing controller.”

In contrast to Applicant's claimed invention, Yanagi explicitly teaches synchronous circuits 4 that synchronize actuation of red, green, and the back light 2. Specifically, Applicant respectfully asserts that Yanagi explicitly discloses in Figure 3,

for example, synchronous circuits 4 that synchronize actuation of red, green, and the back light 2 that carries out time-sharing actuation and irradiates the light source with three blue colors, and a liquid crystal panel 1 and a back light 2.

Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that Yanagi fails to teach or suggest backlight controller structure that has “a backlight controller connected to the sequential backlight to control the timing of light emissions in the transmission mode or reflection mode” as required by amended independent claims 1 and 11. Further, the synchronous circuits 4 recited in Yanagi differs from backlight controller recited in independent claims 1 and 11. Similarly, claim 8 is differs from Yanagi. Accordingly, claims 1-20 are allowable over Ozawa ‘658, Ozawa ‘062, and Yanagi.

The rejection of claims 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable Ozawa ‘658’ in view of Ozawa ‘062 and further in view of Yanagi and further in view of U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0145691 to Kubota (hereinafter “Kubota”) is respectively traversed and reconsideration is requested. Claims 21-23 are allowable over Ozawa ‘658, Ozawa ‘062, and Yanagi for the same reasons as for claim 11, and Kubota fails to cure the deficiencies of the previously cited references, so claims 21-23 are allowable over the cited references.


Applicants believe the foregoing remarks place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: 3 August 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Eric J. Nuss

Registration No.: **40,106**

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicant